

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. Claims

Claims 1-10 and 12 are pending. Claim 11 has been previously cancelled.

II. Telephone Interview

The Applicant would like to thank Examiner Herrera for granting and conducting a telephone interview on July 8, 2010.

During the interview the distinguishing features of claim 1 were discussed in detail. Specifically, the Applicant's representative explained that claim 1 recites: (1) that the communication terminal includes a personal information determination section determining, based on the presentation attribute transmitted from the first terminal, whether the presentation of the personal information of the first terminal stored in the personal information storage section to the second terminal is permitted, and (2) that the communication terminal includes a personal information presentation section presenting, to the second terminal, only the personal information acquired from the first terminal that has been determined by the personal information determination section (of the communication terminal) to be permitted to be presented to the second terminal. As a result, the present invention restricts the transfer of personal information based on the presentation attribute.

Further, for exemplary purposes only, the Applicant's representative explained that the features of the communication terminal, the first terminal and the second terminal are illustrated in, at least, Figs. 1, 2, 18 and 19.

Next, the Applicant's representative explained that Deeds teaches that a profile/caller table 300a/320 illustrates profile data and/or caller identification data to be used when the content data 26 is unlocked, and teaches that a profile/caller table 300b/320b illustrates profile data and/or caller identification data to be used when the content data 26 is locked. Such that, when the content data is locked, executable content, such as a music tune, is prevented from being executed (see Fig. 3; and paragraphs [0037], [0039], [0044], and [0047]).

The Examiner kindly agreed that Deeds does not teach limitations (1) and (2) as recited in claim 1.

In addition, the Applicant's representative explained that Demsky teaches determining, for each terminal of transmission destinations, whether or not viewing of information transmitted by the transmission source is restricted at the terminal, such that, when information is presented from a source terminal to other terminals, the disclosure of the information for each "other" terminal is restricted on a terminal-by-terminal basis (see Figs. 2 and 3, and col. 7, lines 4, 5, 18-23 and 30-35). Moreover, it was submitted that the invention of Demsky is not structured to support the transmission of the presentation attribute and the personal information (regarding the first terminal) from the first terminal to the communication terminal, such that, only if the presentation attributed transmitted from the first terminal permits a transfer of the personal information, will the communication terminal then transmit the personal information received from the first terminal to the second terminal, as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner kindly agreed that, in view of the above, Demsky does not teach limitations (1) and (2) as recited in claim 1.

As a result, the Examiner agreed that the Deeds and Demsky references do not appear to disclose or suggest the structure required by independent claim 1, as well as independent claims

10 and 12. Therefore, the Examiner kindly indicated that, after the Applicant files a response, he would need to update his search in order to determine the patentability of the claimed invention.

Finally, during the interview, the Examiner suggested that the Applicant explain in detail portions of the specification that provide support for the claimed invention.

III. Support for the Claimed Invention

As requested by the Examiner (see section II above), support for the claimed invention can be found, at least, in the following portions of the specification.

A communication system, as a whole, which includes the claimed communication terminal, as well as a first and second communication terminal is illustrated in Figs. 1, 2, 18 and 19 and described on pages 10-13 and 27-29 of the substitute specification submitted on January 27, 2009. Specifically, note that the specification states, on page 10, that “*FIG. 1 illustrates an exemplary case where the communication system includes two mobile phones, but the number of mobile phones may be greater than two.*”

In view of the above, for example, reference elements 11 and 12 of Figs. 1 and 2 and reference elements 51 and 52 of Figs. 18 and 19 provide support for the claimed communication terminal. Further, since the communication system, as described in the specification, can include more than two communication terminals, the first and second communication terminals, as recited in the independent claims, could, for example, be equated with reference elements 11 and 12 of Figs. 1 and 2 and reference elements 51 and 52 of Figs. 18 and 19.

Now, turning to the specific limitations of the communication terminal of claim 1, the Applicant notes that, for example, at least, (i) the communication section 108, 109 and 508, as illustrated in Figs. 2 and 19 provide support for the claimed communication section, (ii) the

personal information storage section 104 and the server 53, as illustrated in Figs. 2 and 18 provide support for the claimed personal information storage section, (iii) the personal information determination section 106 and 506, as illustrated in Figs. 2 and 19 provide support for the claimed personal information determination section, and (iv) the personal information presentation section 105 and 505, as illustrated in Figs. 2 and 19 provide support for the claimed personal information presentation section. Support for the similar limitations of independent claims 10 and 12 can also be found in the above-noted portions of the specification and drawings.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is fully described and supported by the specification and drawings, such that a person of ordinary skill in the art would be able to make and/or use the claimed invention.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Deeds (U.S. 2003/0120500) and Demsky (U.S. 7,107,317). Further, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Deeds, Demsky and Emerson (U.S. 2003/0043974).

As discussed above, during the interview the Examiner kindly acknowledged that Deeds and Demsky fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 10 and 12. As a result, independent claims 1, 10 and 12 and claims 2-8 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Deeds and Demsky. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-10 and 12 is respectfully requested.

Regarding the Emerson reference, the Applicant notes that Emerson was only relied upon for teaching the features of dependent claim 8. Further, Emerson fails to disclose or suggest the above-noted features of claim 1 that are lacking from the Deeds and Demsky references. As a result, by virtue of its dependent on claim 1, claim 8 would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Deeds, Demsky and Emerson.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazuyuki KASHIWABARA

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2010.07.15 14:33:14 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicant

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 15, 2010